



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,053	04/06/2000	James W. Williams	29666/35415	1413

7590 02/26/2003

Marshall O'Toole Gerstein
Murray & Borun
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-6402

EXAMINER

WANG, SHENGJUN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/529,053	Applicant(s) WILLIAMS ET AL.
	Examiner Shengjun Wang	Art Unit 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2002 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 16-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) . 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) . 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The request filed on November 27, 2002 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/529053 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weithmann et al. (US Patent 5,556,870) in view of Flamand et al. (CAPLUS Abstract, AN 1991:581163), Hammer (AIDS 1996, vol. 10, suppl 3, s1-s11).

3. Weithmann et al. teach a method of treating disorder in which interleukin 1 beta is involved. The disorders includes viral infections, such as HIV or hepatitis, comprising administering leflunomide to the patient. See, particularly, the abstract and the claim. The dosage may range from 3-50 mg daily, but may be higher if required. See, particularly, column 3, lines 7-16.

Weithmann et al. does not teach expressly the amount effective to inhibit viral virion assembly. However, the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., effective amount for a therapeutical dosage of a known therapeutical agent, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215. Further, treating a disease with an agent in a host would lead the agent contacting the pathogenic cell. A method known to be useful for

treating viral infection would have been reasonably expected to be useful for prophylactic purpose. Further, known anti-viral agents would have been reasonably expected to be effective in vitro against virus. Finally, since leflunomide is effective against virus through different mechanism, it would have been reasonably expected to effective against those virus with resistance to antiviral agent that inhibit viral DNA replication.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weithmann et al. (US Patent 5,556,870) in view of Flamand et al. (CAPLUS Abstract, AN 1991:581163).

Claim 19 is obvious for reasons discussed above and in further view of Flamand et al. Weithmann et al. do not teach expressly the method for treating herpes.

4. However, Flamand et al. teaches that herpes infection is involved with interleukin 1 beta. See the abstract.

5. Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to employ the method of Weithmann for treating herpes infections.

6. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the method of Weithmann for treating herpes infections, because herpes infection is known to be involved interleukin 1 beta.

7. Claims 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weithmann et al. (US Patent 5,556,870) in view of Hammer (AIDS 1996, vol. 10, suppl 3, s1-s11).

8. Claims 22 and 23 are obvious over Weithmann et al. as discussed above, and further in view of Hammer (AIDS 1996, vol. 10, suppl 3, s1-s11).

Weithmann et al. do not teach expressly the employment of addition antiviral agent in the method.

9. However, Hammer teaches that several pyrimidin compounds are known antiviral agents. See, particularly, page s3.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to employ a combination of leflunomide compounds with other antiviral agents such as those known pyrimidin compounds. Also, it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught in the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form third composition that is to be used for very the same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art; thus , the claimed invention which employ a combination of two known anti-viral agents sets forth *prima facie* obvious subject matter. See In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069.

Further, combination therapies for viral infection are known to be better than single agent therapy. See, Hammer, page s2, the paragraph of combination therapy.

Claims 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coghlan et al. (WO 94/24095) in view of McChesney et al. (Transplantation, Vol. 57, no. 12, page 1717-1722).

10. Coghlan et al. teaches compounds with structures and biological activity closely related to leflunomide or its active metabolite. See, particularly, the abstract, page 2, the examples and the claims. These compounds are known to be useful for treating or preventing viral infection such as hepatitis and cytomegalovirus infection. See, page 4, lines 23-32.

11. Coghlan et al. does not teach expressly the employment leflunomide or its metabolite, or the particular amount herein for administration.
12. However, McChesney et al. teaches that both leflunomide and A771726 are known to be effective in preventing viral infection. See, particularly, the abstract at page 1717, and the materials and method at page 1717-1718.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to employ the compounds taught by Coghlan et al., including both leflunomide and A771726, for treating or prevention viral infections such as hepatitis and CMV.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the compounds taught by Coghlan et al., including both leflunomide and A771726, for treating or prevention viral infections such as hepatitis and CMV because these compounds are known to be useful for treating or preventing viral infection, and both leflunomide and A771726 are known to be similarly useful as the other compounds. Further, known anti-viral agents would have been reasonably expected to be effective *in vitro* against virus. Finally, since leflunomide is effective against virus through different mechanism, it would have been reasonably expected to effective against those virus with resistance to antiviral agent that inhibit viral DNA replication.

Claims 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coghlan et al. (WO 94/24095) in view of McChesney et al. (Transplantation, Vol. 57, no. 12, page 1717-1722), in further view of Flamand et al. (CAPLUS Abstract, AN 1991:581163).

Claim 19 is obvious for reasons discussed above and in further view of Flamand et al.

Coghlan et al. (WO 94/24095), and McChesney et al. do not teach expressly the method for treating herpes.

13. However, Flamand et al. teaches that herpes infection is involved with interleukin 1 beta. See the abstract.

14. Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to employ the method of Weithmann for treating herpes infections.

15. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the method of Coghlan for treating herpes infections, because herpes infection is known to be involved interleukin 1 beta.

16. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coghlan et al. (WO 94/24095) in view of McChesney et al. (Transplantation, Vol. 57, no. 12, page 1717-1722), and further in view of Hammer (AIDS 1996, vol. 10, suppl 3, s1-s11).

Coghlan et al. (WO 94/24095), and McChesney et al. do not teach expressly the employment of addition antiviral agent in the method.

17. However, Hammer teaches that several pyrimidin compounds are known antiviral agents. See, particularly, page s3.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to employ a combination of leflunomide compounds with other antiviral agents such as those known pyrimidin compounds Also, it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught in the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form third composition that is to be used for very the same

Art Unit: 1617

purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art; thus , the claimed invention which employ a combination of two known anti-viral agents sets forth *prima facie* obvious subject matter. See In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069. Further, combination therapies for viral infection are known to be better than single agent therapy. See, Hammer, page s2, the paragraph of combination therapy.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-4554. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Examiner



Shengjun Wang

February 21, 2003